

REMARKS

In paragraph 1 of the final Office Action dated December 19, 2005, claims 1 – 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As discussed below, applicant amends the claims to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 112.

With regards to the Examiner's concerns raised in Paragraph 2 of the final Office Action, claims 1 and 21 have been amended to remove the term "directly" as being confusing and not necessary to point out and distinctly claim the invention. Line 6 of Claim 1 has also been amended to clarify that the thermoplastic resin is the contacting resin of line 5. In addition, applicant has removed the language regarding the low flow state and high flow state from claims 1 and 21. This language is also confusing and not necessary to point out and distinctly claim the present invention. Since the low flow/high flow language is no longer in the claims, it is not necessary to clarify whether or not the fibrous body forms a physical barrier when the thermosetting resin is in the high flow state, as requested by the Examiner in Paragraph 2 of the Office Action. However, in the interest of clarification, it should be pointed out that the fibrous body forms a physical barrier only when the composite product is in an uncured state. The fibrous body does not form a physical barrier between the thermosetting resin and hardening agent when the uncured composite product is heated to provide a cured composite material.

Claims 2 and 3 are amended to require that a fibrous reinforcement layer be located on both sides of the hardening agent layer and the resin layer, respectively. Support for these amendments are found in FIGS. 4/5 and FIG. 3, respectively. In addition, claims 4-6 have been canceled since their dependency on claims 1-3 render them inconsistent in view of the amendments to these three claims. In addition, applicant has made some minor amendments throughout the claims to remove

improper multiple dependencies and to make the claims consistent with the amended claims 1 - 3 and 21.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests that this application be reconsidered and that the claims, as now amended, be allowed. All of the amendments are intended to place the application in a better condition for allowance and do not raise any new issues that require a further search of the prior art. Accordingly, the amendments are properly made after final rejection.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview held on January 19, 2006. The interview was very helpful in providing clarification of the rejections and giving applicant a basis for presenting better claim language to better distinguish the instant claims from the teachings of the cited references.

Dated: February 03, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/David J. Oldenkamp/
David J. Oldenkamp, Reg.# 29,421
HEXCEL CORPORATION
11711 Dublin Boulevard
Dublin, California 94568
(925) 551-4900 x 4394 (Telephone)
(925) 828-3213 (Facsimile)